	3
1	ALSO PRESENT:
2	
3	MS. KIM BARON
4	MR. DEREK PARNELL
5	MS. MONA ANDERSON
6	·
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 .	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Betty D. Glissman, CCR

		4
1	MR. POTEET:	
2	Pledge of Allegiance.	
3	(Pledge of Allegiance)	
4	MR. POTEET:	
5	Kim, roll call, please.	١
6	MS. BARON:	
7	John Poteet?	
8	MR. POTEET:	
9	Here.	
10	MS. BARON:	
11	George Brewer?	
12	MR. BREWER:	
13	Here.	
14	MS. BARON:	
15	Dino Taylor?	
16	MR. TAYLOR:	
17	Here.	
18	MS. BARON:	
19	Tony Cormier?	
20	MR. CORMIER:	
21	(No response.)	
22	MS. BARON:	
23	Ron Duplessis?	
24	MR. DUPLESSIS:	
25	Here.	
		J

\$2,099,000. Hearings and fines were up to \$65,600. Down at the bottom of the page, your current liabilities were \$30,000.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On Page 2, the deferred revenue for 2015 was \$261,750. On Page 3 is your statement of revenues, expenses, and changes The year-to-date revenue in net position. in the middle of the page was \$1,092,935 compared to \$1,059,000 last year, an increase of about \$33,000. Under expenses, the salaries were \$414,900, and the related benefits were -- on the next page were \$216,650. The remainder of the expenses were \$176,000 compared to \$184,000 last The maintenance -- under maintenance -- other maintenance there, we included payment for the new sign that was -- you saw at the end of the parking lot and we reduced the cost on that. Originally, we had gotten some quotes that were a little higher than that, but we reduced the cost by utilizing the existing posts and just painting them, trying to do a little upgrade.

On Page 5, the year-to-date net position was a gain of \$285,000 compared to

\$305,000 last year. On Page 6 is -- you can see the month-to-month net position, revenues, expenses, and that's shown graphically on Page 7. The revenues were down at the end of the period and the expenses are level. On Page 8 is the fee revenue. The UD licenses and the auction transaction fees represent -- represented the majority of the fees and we did have some increase in the salesman -- salesperson licenses.

1.2

1.4

On Page 9, the certificate of deposit report, the two Landmark Bank CDs matured and the rate was slightly lower. It was point seven. It's now point six-five.

On Page 10, the accounts receivable hearings, we had \$5,750 added to the -- assessed during the period and we collected \$5,200. Some of the collections that are shown in that column there are cumulative over a couple of months. The remainder -- what remained in the hearings and hearing fines is \$65,600. We sent the final collection letter on Value Imports and as soon as we get the postal receipt back on

1 MR. POTEET:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That motion passes.

So next we'll move on to proposed budget amendments.

MS. ANDERSON:

In your packet, there's a proposed budget amendment to adjust the budget for the '13/'14 fiscal year to bring it in line with -- more in line with what actually happened. This budget was prepared at the end of 2012 and, as always, we need to adjust some line items. The first column shows you what the original budget was. second column is an estimate of our end of The third column would be what would be remaining in the budget, and then our proposed budget amendments, and if those are passed, what the revised budget will look The revenues were amended to bring them in line with the anticipated end-of-year revenues. We had budgeted a minimal amount of \$40,000 in hearing costs and fines. That's being amended, and so that -- the -- what was remaining in the budget will be \$26,000. So we're amending

the revenues to show that. The -- we originally budgeted a five percent increase in fee revenue and there just was not that much growth in that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the next page, the adjustments to the expenses are among various line The total is on the last page. items. We're proposing to adjust the expenses down by 69 and the net position would be -reflect \$20,787 in lieu of a loss of 22. Some of the items that are being changed, there were no major purchases of assets. didn't purchase an additional vehicle. thought we were going to need to purchase That didn't happen. that extra vehicle. And the office purchases were absorbed in the other line items of the budget. budget originally contained funds to implement a new licensing program. out that we did not need to do that. didn't find a program that was more adequate than what we currently use. So we're moving that money around within the budget and like I said, the amended budget will show a positive \$20,787.

1	2
MR. POTEET:	
A big reduction in legal expense.	
Good job, guys.	
MS. ANDERSON:	
We always budget to the maximum	
of the contract and, of course, we didn't	
spend all of that.	
MR. POTEET:	
Okay. So I think we need a	
motion to approve this.	
MR. SMITH:	
I'll make a motion.	
MR. POTEET:	
Darty.	
MR. TAYLOR:	
Second.	
MR. POTEET:	
Dino second.	
All in favor, say, "Aye."	
(All "Aye" responses.)	
MR. POTEET:	
Any opposed?	
(No response.)	
MR. POTEET:	
All right. So motion to approve	
	MR. POTEET: A big reduction in legal expense. Good job, guys. MS. ANDERSON: We always budget to the maximum of the contract and, of course, we didn't spend all of that. MR. POTEET: Okay. So I think we need a motion to approve this. MR. SMITH: I'll make a motion. MR. POTEET: Darty. MR. TAYLOR: Second. MR. POTEET: Dino second. All in favor, say, "Aye." (All "Aye" responses.) MR. POTEET: Any opposed? (No response.) MR. POTEET:

1	the proposed amendments.
2	All right. And we've got one
3	more financial matter. We have legal.
4	MR. PARNELL:
5	Commissioners, please find within
6	your packet Commission Counselor Morris'
7	balance sheet, which illustrates the bill of
8	services for the month of April 2014. The
9	amount balance due is \$3,456.25. I have
10	reviewed the detailed bill of services and I
11	have had accounting go through and make sure
12	that the hours are accurate and I ask that
13	you would approve payment of Counsel Morris'
14	balance sheet I'm sorry, balance due of
15	\$3,456.25.
16	MR. POTEET:
17	A motion?
18	MR. BREWER:
19	I make a motion to approve.
20	MR. SMITH:
21	I'll second.
22	MR. POTEET:
23	Second by Darty.
24	All in favor, say, "Aye."
25	(All "Aye" responses.)

1	MR. POTEET:
2	Any opposed?
3	(No response.)
4	MR. PARNELL:
5	Moving forward and I will just
6	put in the balance sheet, I received the
7	detailed listing of it. I do review that,
8	but if that's something that I'll go
9	ahead and just put the balance sheet in the
10	packets.
11	MR. POTEET:
12	That's okay with me.
13	Anybody have any questions?
14	That's always available to review. Okay.
15	Let's move on to the Executive
16	Director's report.
17	MR. PARNELL:
18	Commissioners, if you would turn
19	with me to your books your binders, under
20	complaint totals, you'll find that we have
21	reports we have alleged issue counts.
22	There were 141 alleged issues for the month
23	of April 2014. The next document that you
24	see is the case report, which illustrates
25	the amount of cases that were assigned to

those investigators. There were a total of 102 cases that were assigned. Forty-two of those cases were completed, which means 60 of those cases remain open. The detailed summary report illustrates that for the month of April, there were 83 cases that were closed for the month. Investigators have been working really hard in trying to satisfy consumer complaints and assuring that the licensees are in compliance. Other actions were three audits were conducted, 83 work audits and site visits were conducted, 39 physical inspections, titles getting assisted, being delivered to consumer were Total number of refunds for the month was \$6,353.17.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the next item will be general information. I just wanted to let you know we did do some interviewing for the investigator position in Area 3. We did find someone that we really liked and has some background in -- he has a little bit of military background, but he also has some, I guess you would say, law enforcement background. Right now, I'm working with

1	Civil Service, because what they're telling
2	me now is that the law enforcement
3	background that he has doesn't classify him
4	into the position that we're requesting. So
5	I'm trying to work with them, so I can get
6	them to allow me to have a provision where I
7	can they will allow him to move into that
8	position. There's been a lot of
9	investigative background, a lot of but, I
10	mean, Civil Service, sometimes it's kind of
11	difficult to get things done the way I want
12	to. So I'm just working with them on that.
13	And that pretty much concludes the Executive
14	Director's report.
15	MR. POTEET:
16	Where is 3, is that Lafayette?
17	MR. PARNELL:
18	Yes. The Lafayette area, yes.
19	MR. POTEET:
20	If we get that position filled,
21	are we all caught up with investigators now?
22	MR. PARNELL:
23	Yes.
24	MR. POTEET:
25	Will we still have an open
	·

1 position? MR. PARNELL: 2 No. We won't have an open 3 position, but I would, you know, in the 4 future still like to bring on two additional 5 -- of course, we could have two in the New 6 Orleans area in District 5 and two in the 7 Baton Rouge area in District 4. Ideally, I 8 think if we had seven right now, two in 9 those areas, we would be able to be a little 10 bit more productive on what we're doing. 11 MR. POTEET: 12 Proactive. 13 MR. PARNELL: 14 15 Yes. 16 MR. POTEET: Or productive, too. We will be. 17 MR. PARNELL: 18 Yes. So -- and that's reactive 19 to what's going on out there. 20 MR. POTEET: 21 22 All right. 23 MR. TAYLOR: 24 Does that put Montie in Shreveport -- staying in Shreveport? 25

1 MS. BARON: 2 Shreveport and Monroe. 3 MR. PARNELL: 4 Yes. He won't have to come down 5 to work Area 3 like he's doing now. He and Ronnie have spent a lot of time on the road 6 working these other areas, helping out. 7 Well, they all do that, but it's a lot more 8 -- many more dealers in the New Orleans and 9 10 Baton Rouge area. So they get inundated 11 down here quite easily. MR. POTEET: 12 13 You know, this is not for -- you 14 know, I'm not going to call you on this 15 later, but two questions about this. One, 16 do you think that you're going to be able 17 convince Civil Service? MR. PARNELL: 18 19 I do, because they've allowed me 20 to change something before and get -- I do, 21 but I just have to talk to the right person. 22 MR. POTEET: 23 And then what do you think the 24 time line is, a few weeks, months? MR. PARNELL: 25

I hope so. So discussions have kind of started and I think within the next few weeks or so -- they did -- the last time, they gave me a pretty good timeline and it only took about a week or so. It only took about two weeks. So I should be able to have somebody out.

MR. POTEET:

Good, excellent.

MR. PARNELL:

If not -- if they don't allow me to do that, I'm -- we're going to have to try to go out and post, again. What was sent to me as far as applications really wasn't that great, to be honest with you, and this gentleman I found, he has done a lot of work investigating. It's just that the way they classify positions, his law enforcement just doesn't meet exactly the level that they want him to have. So he's been a private eye in the past, but -- and he's also got drug enforcement and he's also done some stuff as a detective, you know, but --

MR. POTEET:

1	Well, we have confidence in you.
2	MR. PARNELL:
3	It's Civil Service's job
4	description for the Compliance Investigator
5	3. It's their requirements for the
6	minimum requirements for the position, it
7	requires them to have X amount of law
8	enforcement, and he has it, but they don't
9	classify it as the level that I believe he
10	has.
11	MS. BARON:
12	It didn't have a specific title,
13	right?
14	MR. PARNELL:
15	Right.
16	MR. POTEET:
17	Okay. Committee report, the
18	Legislative Session.
19	MR. DUPLESSIS:
20	Okay. We have three bills out
21	there that concern us this year.
22	And, Derek, nothing we're playing
23	defense on that I see.
24	MR. PARNELL:
25	Well, no, not necessarily,

possibly on -- well, 770 is our bill that we have out there, which when we were in the Senate, Senator Martiny kind of mentioned to us that he wanted to put on some amendments out there on the bill, because he felt like there wasn't enough penalties for the dealer as it relates to the down payment and -deposit and down payment. Once it went to the Senate floor, Senator Martiny --Counselor Morris suggested that he -- we work with him on putting that amendment out And it went to the Senate floor and there. he went ahead and put it out there and -which, in my opinion -- and I will let Ms. Morris kind of talk about it a little bit, kind of changes the intent of our legislation as it relates to the down payment and the disclosure. Now, we have, I quess, two options at this point. We can go ahead and accept the amendment and let the rest of the bill go through or we can allow the bill -- talk to Representative Price and have the bill go to the Conference Committee, but I'll let Ms. Morris kind of talk about the Conference Committee and what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 the pros and cons are about that.

MS. MORRIS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The concern that Senator Martiny expressed in committee was that he didn't feel that it was fair to have -- if a dealer took a deposit from someone, and then another customer came and wanted the same car and offered to pay more that the dealer just had to return the deposit and there wasn't any penalty on the dealer side and there would be the inconvenience possibly on prospective purchaser's side. So we had a meeting at the commissioner's office on something else that was scheduled at the time the bill came up. Mr. Hallack and I, we discussed including an amendment. We had told Senator Martiny we would be happy to work with him, but our intent was more to clear up the misunderstanding between the customers and the dealers as to how to handle a deposit, because we wind up with those complaints. And so we were going to put some language in there to make it -- the dealer would have to refund one and a half times what the deposit was if the dealer

just backed out without any cause.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So before we got that in -- and we were not aware that the bill was on the Senate floor that day. It passed the Senate floor with Senator Martiny, but really what we did was we took out -- we said that you have to give the customer a disclosure and we said under these conditions, you have to return the deposit and under these conditions, you don't. Well, he took all of that out. So he says we have to provide a It's now going to say that it disclosure. has to include the amount of the deposit, down payment, whether the money is given as a deposit or down payment, and the terms and conditions for return or forfeiture of the deposit by the customer, which we're, I think, back to sort where we were before, that the dealer just put all deposits non-refundable.

And this kind of gives them the

-- right now I don't think they have
authority under State law to do that,
because the law of deposits would control
whatever you put on the form, but if the law

says that you're required to give disclosure about the terms, which is refundable, maybe this overrides the law of deposit. It's an argument that I don't think we want to be in the middle of.

MR. POTEET:

It sounds like it's got a built in loophole.

MS. MORRIS:

Well, it lets the dealers go back to what they were doing.

MR. HALLACK:

The dealer can do whatever they want to do.

MR. POTEET:

It's an endorsement of that.

MS. MORRIS:

And it may be -- and it might

pass muster with the court, because the

legislatures said you can -- as long as you

give disclosure, it may be okay. So it's

concerning, but at the same time, you have

to kind of look at the process and the

process is at this point in the second

chamber, it was -- since it was amended the

second time, it goes back to the House side and Representative Price can reject to the amendment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But by rejecting an amendment, it puts it in Conference Committee. Conference Committee is kind of a dangerous thing to me, because you don't get to participate. There will be six members, three from the House, three from the Senate appointed. Chairman of the Conference Committee will be on it and then the author of the bill, and then three other people. So in Conference Committee, anything can be put on your bill. You don't have any really good mechanism to show up in here and explain and hear what's They just issue -- they meet when they can and they issue a report, and then when the report comes back, each Chamber can accept or reject it.

If either Chamber rejects it or if it's something that we don't agree with, then we're going to have to pull the bill.

And this particular bill, we have some other things that we felt like we needed in the bill and that was the false advertisement

issue and clarification on the auction. So it's a risk to put it in Conference Committee and we just kind of have to decide if it's a risk for us to take. It is -session ends June 2nd, which is -ordinarily, it goes through June, but June 2nd is the last day, and what happens is, you get closer to the end of session. we were in Conference Committee early, the session might be a different deal, but if -people that have lost bills that they were promoting or whatever are looking for a bill to attach onto and they can do it by Conference Committee. So you can get some very odd things attached onto your bill or things that are really -- it could have to do with somebody else and you don't really care, because you're not interested in that very law, but it could really reverse everything that you have in your own bill. So this late in the game, it's a difficult issue.

MR. POTEET:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So maybe I didn't understand this right. When this goes back to Price, he can

	27
1	if he rejects the amendment, then it goes
2	to Conference Committee?
3	MS. MORRIS:
4	Correct.
5	MR. POTEET:
6	He can't make any changes other
7	than to reject it?
8	MS. MORRIS:
9	Correct. He can accept or
10	reject.
11	MR. POTEET:
12	Accept or reject.
13	MR. PARNELL:
14	And I told him that we would be
15	meeting today and let him know what we
16	decide today. So we can go ahead and move
17	forward.
18	MR. POTEET:
19	It sounds like we're suggesting
20	that we let it go.
21	MS. MORRIS:
22	It's one of those if he calls
23	because you don't know who is watching
24	the bill and maybe has we know that with
25	someone that has that suggested that we
	1

put an amendment in our bill, which we didn't feel like relative to auctions. We didn't feel that it was appropriate, and so I don't know if they're still watching the bill or whatever. So it just kind of --

MR. DUPLESSIS:

1 .

Well, it has to be germane to the law in the session.

MS. MORRIS:

It does, but they will not strike it down for germaneness, and then our bill is subject to attack in court. I'm going to give you an example. This is a real life example.

When I started with the
Cosmetology Board 14 years ago, they had a
piece of legislation and someone had to
amend -- to change the composition of the
Board and the Board was against it and the
Governor's Office was against it and
everybody was against it. So they thought
they got that amendment off and they thought
they won. Well, the last day of session or
so, there was a bill in Conference Committee
dealing with the Racing Committee, which has

nothing to do with the Cosmetology Board, and so the people that lost their amendment, they attached it on the Racing Committee's bill and it passed without the Cosmetology Board knowing about it, without the Governor's Office knowing about it. So it passed, because the Racing Commission got the language they wanted, so they didn't care what else was on the bill.

So then they get a letter from the Governor's Office saying that, you know, so and so is being appointed. Well, he isn't even qualified to be on the Board. Well, he does because of act number such and such. So things like that happen.

I've been involved where, you know, people can put something that has to do with Motor Vehicles, which is germane, but it's something that you really would not support. So it's a gamble one way or another.

You also have the ability to pull the bill. It's our bill and Representative Price can reject the Conference Committee order, but that leaves us with no bill. We

won't have the other things we want. And so it's just whether or not you feel like that's a risk that you want to take. And there's really no way to tell.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

It's clear. Let the bill fly through.

MS. MORRIS:

And then next year come back and fix it.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

And get ahold of Martiny, because you -- I think we've worked with Martiny before and he's pretty reasonable. Every now and then he does a knee jerk reaction and he kind of goes in the session and he is not listening as well as he should, but if you have a year to present it to him and show him what's going on, I think it's no different than what we're doing. It's not a catastrophic issue to us. It could be a pain to us.

MS. MORRIS:

The only downside, I told Derek was, you know, we're going to start

requiring disclosure and the disclosure will be under this clause and we will try to come back and change it next year. The dealers will have to change their disclosures, again, but -- so it's an inconvenience to the dealer in that respect possibly, but, really, if you're following the law of deposit, you really shouldn't have to -- I mean, we can make it like the law of deposit and you wouldn't have to change your disclosures, but the ones that say all deposits are not refundable, they are -- they would have to come back, because --

1.0

Well, our two biggest problems
that we're seeing in terms of consumer
complaints are, one, there is no agreement
and the dealer just holds -- keeps the
money, period. And we've had hearings on
that issue before. Where there is no
contract, it would fall back to the law on
earnest money, but the problem is, you also
have dealers that write these deposit
disclosure agreements that are very onerous
on the consumer and, you know, it requires

exorbitant mileage. Everybody is familiar with the bailment agreement, 50 cents a mile, \$50 a day, and those things will hold water. That's a contract that the person agrees to under the law that we're trying to propose. A dealer can't do that kind of thing. He's restricted in what he can charge for certain things. So, you know, it's a big problem in the industry, not with good dealers.

MS. MORRIS:

1.5

He didn't take out our day rate and mileage reimbursement if the consumer takes the vehicle. So you are restricted to that amount. He didn't take that part out.

MR. HATTACK:

Well, I thought he took out all of the disclosure requirements.

MS. MORRIS:

No. He's making the disclosure, but the lines that he took out were the failure to perform under the terms of the agreement, including or not limited to, the dealer's failure to provide the vehicle for its intended use and the ability of the

customer to get financing. He took out those. He didn't take out our day rate. He took out -- his language says that you have to disclose the terms and conditions, but he took out some of our terms and conditions. I don't think it does really what he said his problem was. It does something else, but he did leave part of ours in there.

MR. HALLACK:

1.8

His original position was that he wanted to create something that was more consumer friendly, but what he did with his amendment make it --

MS. MORRIS:

Less consumer friendly, in my view.

MR. POTEET:

Well, that's what -- to Ron's point, I think what we do is let this go through, and then have a year to discuss it with him and say, look, you know, what happened was your intentions -- we understand your intentions, but basically we interpreted that and this is why we'd like to change it and this is somebody that we've

worked with before without much trouble, 1 2 maybe he'll deal with that. 3 MR. HALLACK: 4 One of the biggest problems in the law the way that it is written right now 5 is if the consumer cannot obtain financing 6 7 for the deal, the dealer has to eat the entire deposit, and we've had a series of 8 9 problems including some complaints out of New Orleans where the --10 11 MR. DUPLESSIS: 12 The consumer never has to eat the 13 entire deposit. 14 MR. HALLACK: 15 Right. The consumer loses. 16 Right, that's correct. The way our law is 17 structured, the way it's written right now, 18 if a consumer can't get financing, the 19 dealer loses the entire deposit. 20 MR. POTEET: 21 The consumer, you're not saying 22 the dealer. 23 MR. DUPLESSIS: 24 The dealer has to return the 25 deposit.

MR. HALLACK:

Has to return the deposit. I'm sorry.

MS. MORRIS:

But I think under this section,
you could put that in your disclosure. See,
he took it out of the law, but he said you
have to disclose the terms. So you can
probably write your disclosure that way.
But it's not -- we might make them write the
disclosure like that.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Sheri, you can't contract against what's in the law.

MS. MORRIS:

Right. He just took out -- we were making it specific that if the consumer didn't give adequate or accurate information about their ability to obtain financing and insurance, then the dealer got to keep the deposit. He just took that out, but I don't know that it necessarily precludes you from putting that in your disclosure.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Well, right now, the law is, you

have to return the deposit.

MR. HALLACK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The dealer must return the deposit.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Right.

MR. HALLACK:

We have a couple of dealers that are complaining that that's not fair. Τf the consumer can't get financing, then it's the consumer's fault and I shouldn't have to give back the deposit. I know everybody disagrees with that, but we actually have a couple of dealers that are complaining that if the consumer can't get their own financing, I shouldn't have to give back the deposit. I don't agree with that. I'm not saying I agree with it. I'm just telling the Board that we have dealers that are complaining that I shouldn't have to give back a deposit where the consumer can't get financed.

MS. MORRIS:

One way for the dealer to protect themselves if they come with a bank

clearance like they could in the real estate, but they will. I mean, the -- I can go down to the credit union and they can tell you that you can get a line of credit for this amount or something.

MR. HALLACK:

I don't think that's how it

8 works.

Mr. Taylor, what do you think?

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, the last time --

MS. MORRIS:

Before you take the deposit.

MR. TAYLOR:

this, I was kind of leaning more towards

Martiny and his thoughts. If you go all the
way back to discussing -- the dealer is
providing a tool to get the consumer

financed. Ninety times out of a hundred,
even these independent lots, we have an
indirect lending for that. They're telling
the consumer that they're going to get them
financed, and then when they come back in
and you can't get them financed, there's a

whole new problem even though they couldn't do it and it's really a small technicality, but you need to put it in writing. Well, the dealers should have done his homework.

Wouldn't you agree, Ron, to find out if the right fix before you spotted the car? I have a tendency to lean more towards the consumer than the dealer, even though I am a dealer in this case. I don't know if I'm answering your question.

MR. POTEET:

Well, I mean, you know, that seems like a harsh penalty for somebody if they can't get financing to lose their whole deposit.

MR. TAYLOR:

There are times they're just saying that I can get you financed.

MR. POTEET:

What does the dealer -- I mean, you know, what is the dealer giving up for that deposit, a little bit of time, maybe the car is not available for sale, but --

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Well, you're giving up floor

Я

1 planning. You're giving up a drop in the 2 So, you know, you lose three percent 3 on the drop of the book and you lose your 4 floor plan, I don't know \$10 a day for 20 5 days, 200 bucks plus the loss on the books 6 you're looking at. You know, 550 bucks for 7 that period of time is a calculable loss. 8 MR. TAYLOR: 9 I think that they give you 20 10 days or something. 11 MR. DUPLESSIS: 12 Twenty days. 13 MR. POTEET: 14 That's what I was curious how 15 long. 16 MR. TAYLOR: 17 You have a finance manager and if 18 they can't afford it, they would let 19 somebody stay in one of your cars for 20 2.0 days without being able to get that thing 21 funded. 22 MR. DUPLESSIS: 23

I think the difference with us is, we don't spot cars. And I think in the independent world, that is a habit to slow

24

the customer down, if you will, to keep the customer. You go shop credit, but, you know, you get your stips up front, your stipulations and your contracts. In my opinion, if it -- the only time that the customer is going to be his own victim is when he's delusional in the fact that he can get financed and he says, you know, I've got my deal covered and I have -- I can kind get you but I can go to the credit union, and then the credit union won't hook him, then you can be assured he's just not a possibility to be financed. So I think -you know, I have an issue with contracting against the scheme of law. So, you know, I think that's a bad precedent for us to start, where we can allow our dealers to create a contract that puts the consumer in conflict of our -- of State law. I think that's the issue.

MR. HALLACK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, that's Martinez's amendment. Martinez's amendment says the dealer is free to contract in any way he sees fit. So the consumer has to give them

	41
1	has to lose the deposit or whatever.
2	MR. TAYLOR:
3	If that's the case, that is a
4	profit center for a dealer.
5	MR. DUPLESSIS:
6	Sure it is. The gate is open.
7	MR. HALLACK:
8	Sure. Absolutely.
9	MR. POTEET:
10	The gate is open now.
11	MR. HALLACK:
12	It is.
13	MR. DUPLESSIS:
14	Not like this one is going to be.
15	MR. HALLACK:
16	Well, this is going to be the
17	double gate are open.
18	MR. BREWER:
19	About two years ago, we had a
20	dealer in here from New Orleans who was
21	making a living doing that, the old guy.
22	MR. POTEET:
23	I remember that. But this would
24	also I mean, if that does happen, then
25	that certainly gives us some room to work

with Martiny next year to get this done. 1 2 You know, I think right now --3 MS. MORRIS: 4 We have most of the contingencies 5 covered, but that one. 6 MR. POTEET: -- I think what we're looking at 7 8 right now, you know, in real time is, do we 9 want to take a chance on letting this bill 10 get away from us. 11 MR. DUPLESSIS: 12 The answer is, no. 13 MR. POTEET: 14 And the answer is, no. And I 15 think, you know, that we should go ahead and 16 go with this and, you know, try to work on 17 it for next year and try to get it -- and 18 see what happens. I mean, it may prove that 19 the things that Mr. Hallack is saying and 20 that Mr. Duplessis is saying are going to 21 come true and it's even more impetus to get 22 it done correctly. 23 MR. DUPLESSIS: 24 It might be a long year. 25 Sheri, I don't think it's that

1 big a deal, and we're going to have to make 2 decisions in the best interest of the 3 consumers and if we have to go to court. 4 then we'll have to testify. Is there any 5 way of getting our arms around Martiny and talk to him and get him to reconsider this? 6 7 MS. MORRIS: For this session or --8 9 MR. DUPLESSIS: 10 Yes. 11 MS. MORRIS: 12 We can certainly try to meet with 13 him, but I quess --14 MR. POTEET: 15 You have to talk to Price today, 16 right? 17 MS. MORRIS: 18 If Price is going to reject it, he's got to -- he probably has rejected it 19 20 It's scheduled for today, but there is the Republican golf tournament and that's 21 22 where they all are and they are going to be 23 a little while in the House and they go back, because they're going to lose too many 24 25 people.

1	MR. POTEET:
2	Can't they wait until June 3rd?
3	MS. MORRIS:
4	Well, they actually have it a
5	week later, but the session ends June 2.
6	They usually have it the Tuesday after
7	Memorial Day, but they had to move it this
88	year. I don't think that they will get
9	through their whole schedule today or not,
10	but
11	MR. POTEET:
12	Anybody else have anything to say
13	about this? I mean, we've been talking
14	about it. My feeling is we let it go
15	through. I think Ron is saying we need to
16	let it go through.
17	MR. DUPLESSIS:
18	And I'm going to get to the main
19	point of that with the next bill.
20	MR. POTEET:
21	Does anybody else have a
22	MR. TAYLOR:
23	I don't know what else to do.
24	Who orchestrated this in the beginning? I
25	mean, I know we sat here and put some ideas

together, and then just let Martiny -- how does that process go?

MS. MORRIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He is the main Chair of Commerce, and so Representative Price agreed to sponsor our bill and he's a member of the Commerce Committee in the House, and it's better for us to work with somebody on the Commerce Committee, because they can better track it. They've got to do it in committee, anyway. So Representative Price helped us last year and he agreed to help us this year and he's done a very good job of getting in touch with Derek when anything changes, and it went through the House fine. There was no comment or anything, no discussion. When it got to the Senate, the day that we were in the Senate Commerce Committee -- I don't know if y'all have been reading the paper, but there's a bill to change the plumbing code that's drawn a lot of controversy and a lot of people down at the Capitol. We happened to be on that same day. So it was packed. You couldn't even The overflow room was get near the room.

packed. And Representative Price approached Senator Martiny about are we going to be before this bill or after this bill, because we would have been there all day. I think we would have been after the plumbing bill. Then Representative Martiny then started saying this page, this page, started asking all kind of questions, and so we -- that day was kind of hectic in his committee. Senator Martiny is the Chair of the committee. He had a lot on his plate. he didn't really have time to speak with us about it or try to work something out. so when we presented the bill, he did express that concern. He said it's not If I want to buy this car and I put down a deposit, and then the next person I will give you two thousand more, then there is no penalty for the dealer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And I explained to him that that really wasn't what was brought to us and what we were trying to address, but we would work with him on that issue, and so it just kind of made it there before we even sat down with him. So he is the Chair of the

Commerce Committee. So he is going to be on the Conference Committee and it's just the time crunch of being kind of sure of his position before we have to make the call for Representative Price if it does, in fact, come up this afternoon.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

John, my thought is to let it go through before you try to get your hands around Martiny and --

MS. MORRTS:

He's real busy --

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Right.

MS. MORRIS:

-- being the Committee Chair at last day of --

MR. DUPLESSIS:

But if he would try to slow down the unintended consequences maybe I could -you have a good rapport with him and I think he understands that the Commission is doing the right thing. If we can rearrange that language and send it through.

MR. POTEET:

1 Yes. I think with your 2 relationship with him, explain we're on the 3 same page. He's on the same page with us. It's just -- it's a wording thing. 4 5 MS. MORRIS: 6 We don't agree with what he was 7 trying to do. MR. POTEET: В 9 Yes. And maybe he understands, 10 like Mr. Hallack is saying, we'll kind of 11 open it up, maybe we can get it done before we have to get back with Mr. Price. 12 13 MR. DUPLESSIS: 1.4 But I don't think he put it in 15 the Conference Committee. 16 MR. TAYLOR: 17 And if not, we let it through. 18 Is that what you're saying? 19 MR DUPLESSIS: 20 Yes, exactly. And the reason we 21 don't want it in Conference Committee is 22 because of 1089. That's -- if -- you know, 23 if you really want to create an issue, have 2.4 that put in the Conference Committee and

then get it done.

1 MR. TAYLOR: 2 If one goes down, they all go? 3 MR. DUPLESSIS: 4 Pardon me? 5 MR. TAYLOR: 6 If one goes down, they all go? 7 MS. MORRIS: If you put a bill in Conference 8 9 Committee that's germane, that, you know, 10 has to do with used motor vehicles, anything 11 else that's out there that anybody is trying 12 do --13 MR. DUPLESSIS: 14 They can get it attached. 15 So at the end, you don't want to 16 go into where they make the sausage in that room and that's -- you don't want to open 17 18 yourself up to that. So I think as long as everything is floating through. But 1089 19 20 kind of drops -- it drops it down to a B 21 plus rating of non-admitted carriers and 22 approved carriers for contingent liability. 23 That -- the latest update on that is it's

going through just fine. We've got no

opposition. There's no appearance of

24

opposition, but you never know how that works in Conference Committee.

MR. PARNELL:

But there was an amendment on the Senate floor when it go did through where it kind of deleted that information about the B plus rating. It's in your packet. Now, the bill -- at least lines 15 through 17, such policy may be surplus lines of insurance as defined by Revised Statute 22:46. So that language, it did away with the B plus rating or better. So it just says it has to be surplus lines insurance now. So as far as -- you know, where does that put the bill now.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Well, that's an enhancement over what we were trying to get. So that was not a negative. That was a positive to the bill.

MR. POTEET:

Yes. The rating wasn't really the issue, was it?

MR. PARNELL:

No, no, no. It was admitted

versus non-admitted.

MR. DUPLESSIS:

Right. Yes. I knew that bill -that amendment was coming, but that wasn't
detrimental to us. So that was -- that's
what we wanted. And then the last one
talking about the provisional license. I
actually that 1273 is an excellent bill and
I think you're kind of practicing that now
with the provisional license with people
that are suspect in licensing.

MR. PARNETIT:

Right. And it provides relative to the issuance of provisional licenses to ex-offenders in order to -- in order for them to work in certain fields. We brought this up at -- Lessie and I, we kind of discussed this bill. She had concerns with how is it going to affect us, but pretty much now the way -- once we get our licensing applications in, we do our background checks and pretty much now it's almost similar to what we're doing already. I don't feel that this bill is anything that will affect us negatively. What they're

saying is basically that we need to supply individuals with a provisional license. they have an ex-offender and it is not really related to the industry, then we have the right to deny them that. It's kind of similar to what we're doing now. I wouldn't call it a provisional license, but I will issue a license for somebody and put them on probation. It's kind of similar to what we're doing now. If they're background check does come back inappropriate, I will deny it and give them an opportunity to appeal that denial, but they have the opportunity to do that. In talking with Ms. Morris, I think -- did you get in touch with Burgess on that?

MS. MORRIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I didn't.

MR. PARNELL:

Because he had called and he was just asking what our position was on this bill, just to see what -- if we wanted to get together and maybe try to get ourselves exempt from the bill, because they have a couple of -- well, several agencies on there

that are exempt from this, but I just didn't 1 2 even see where it would cause any problems 3 for us. 4 MR. POTEET: 5 Any comments, guys? 6 (No response.) 7 MR. POTEET: 8 It sounds like we're already kind 9 of doing that. I mean, this would be -- if 10 I understand it, so if somebody came in and 11 they had been convicted of selling drugs and 12 now they were paroled, then we could give 13 them a provisional license, because it 14 doesn't deal with us directly. But if 15 somebody came in with some kind of a 16 violation, they lost their used car dealer 17 license in Georgia, then that would be 18 handled differently? 19 MR. PARNELL: 20 Right. It gives you that option. 21 MR. POTEET: 22 You have an option. 23 MR. PARNELL: 24 Yes. It doesn't really do 25 anything for us.

1	MR. POTEET:
2	I don't see anything wrong with
3	that.
4	MS. MORRIS:
5	You're not required to give a
6	license if it's a violent crime, any grade
7	of homicide or sex offense or if the
8	conviction relates involves fraud in the
9	licensed field of work.
10	MS. BARON:
11	Do we have to deny them?
12	MS. MORRIS:
13	You still have discretion.
14	MS. BARON:
15	So we do have discretion.
16	MR. POTEET:
17	Mail fraud, forgery.
18	MS. MORRIS:
19	You would not have to give them a
20	provisional license.
21	MR. POTEET:
22	I think anything that allows us
23	to have the you know, the decision making
24	authority is important rather than having
25	something that you can't decide.

		55
1	MR. TAYLOR:	
2	It's what we're already doing.	
3	It's just putting it on paper and giving us	
4	authority to do that, correct?	
5	MR. PARNELL:	
6	Pretty much, yes.	
7	MR. DUPLESSIS:	ļ
8	That concludes the reports.	
9	MR. POTEET:	
10	Thank you. It looks like we're	
11	moving along pretty well on all that. Okay.	
12	Well, the next thing we have are	
13	the hearings. We need a motion to adjourn.	
14	MR. SMITH:	
15	I make a motion.	
16	MR. BREWER:	
17	Second.	
18	MR. POTEET:	
19	All in favor?	
20	(All "Aye" responses.)	
21		
22	(Meeting adjourned at 10:24 a.m.)	
23		
24		
25		

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETTY D. GLISSMAN, Certified Court Reporter, Certificate No. 86150, in and for the State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that the Louisiana Used Motor Vehicle Commission May 19, 2014 meeting was reported by me in the stenotype reporting method, was prepared and transcribed by me or under my personal direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

This June 2, 2014, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

BETTY D. GLISSMAN, CCR

CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

Betty D. Glissman, CCR